REMARKS

This application has been reviewed in light of the Office Action dated November 23, 2007. Claims 55, 58-60, 63-65, 68 and 69 are presented for examination, of which Claims 55, 60 and 65 are in independent form. Claims 55, 60 and 65 have been amended as to matters of form only. No change in scope is either intended or believed effected by these changes. Favorable reconsideration is requested.

Claims 55, 58-60, 63-65, and 68-69 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,681,392 (Henry) in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,580,177 (Gase et al.).

Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

Claim 55 is directed to an information processing apparatus in communication with one or more client apparatuses via a network. The apparatus includes: (1) determining means for determining a plurality of client apparatuses on which a driver is to be set up; and (2) transmission controlling means for controlling operations to transmit, without waiting for a request from any of the client apparatuses, to each of the plurality of client apparatuses determined by the determining means, a set-up instruction to set up a driver for that client apparatus and a test printing instruction to have the client apparatus execute test printing to check if the driver set-up for the client apparatus has been completed, via the network, wherein the test printing is executed after the driver set up is executed at the client apparatus, and wherein identification information of the plurality of client apparatuses is printed in the test printing at a printer corresponding to the set up driver.

Among other notable features of Claim 55 are: (1) that the information

processing apparatus transmits a test printing instruction to a plurality of client apparatuses; and

(2) that identification information of the plurality of client apparatuses is printed in the test

printing at a printer corresponding to the set up driver.

By virtue of the structure recited in Claim 55, a simple operation of giving an

instruction at the server allows the user to check which one(s) of the plurality of client

apparatuses have completed the driver set up by inspecting a test printing sheet delivered by the

printer (without the need to physically check the plurality of client apparatuses to confirm the

driver set up status for each client apparatus).

Henry relates to a method of installing peripheral software, such as drivers and

utilities, on a system over a network. Henry discusses performing a remote push-install operation

of a driver from the server to a remote system (i.e., a single computer), which may be designated

using a UNC path (S108 of Fig. 1). However, Applicant has found nothing in Henry that would

teach or suggest "transmission controlling means for controlling operations to transmit, without

waiting for a request from any of the client apparatuses, to each of the plurality of client

apparatuses determined by said determining means, a set-up instruction to set up a driver for that

client apparatus and a test printing instruction to have the client apparatus execute test printing to

check if the driver set-up for the client apparatus has been completed, via the network, wherein

the test printing is executed after the driver set up is executed at the client apparatus, and wherein

identification information of the plurality of client apparatuses is printed in the test printing at a

printer corresponding to the set up driver," as recited in Claim 55 (emphasis added). Based on

the Office Action, it is believed that the Examiner does not disagree.

Gase does not remedy the deficiencies of Henry. Gase relates to a network

including plural client processors, a file server and plural printers. The file server includes a memory for storing a most updated printer driver procedure for each printer type connected to the file server. In response to a print request from a client processor, the file server assigns a printer to the requesting client processor. If the client processor determines that a printer driver procedure in its memory for the assigned printer is not identical to a most updated printer driver procedure stored in the memory of the file server, the client processor causes alteration of its printer driver procedure to coincide with the most updated printer driver procedure. Gase discusses that test printing is executed at a printer.

However, Gase fails to teach or suggest transmitting a test printing instruction from the server to a plurality of client apparatuses via the network upon driver set up, and causing the test printing to be executed subsequent to the driver set up at the client apparatuses. The Office Action cites column 5, lines 52-53 as disclosing this feature. Applicant respectfully disagrees. That passage merely discusses that "printing test page" is one type of status regarding a printer that can be displayed at the client processor. However, Applicant submits that nothing in that passage, or anywhere else in Gase, teaches or suggests transmitting a testing printing instruction from the server to a plurality of client apparatuses via the network upon driver set up, and causing the test printing to be executed subsequent to the driver set up at the client apparatuses.

Gase also fails to teach or suggest that the server prepares in advance identification information of the plurality of client apparatuses such that the identification information is included in test print information. The Office Action cites column 4, lines 35-67; column 3, lines 50-67; and column 5, lines 52-53 as teaching that the server "gathers the

8

printer/driver information associated a specific client." The Office Action further states that "[i]t would have been obvious for one having ordinary skill in the art to modify Gase's disclosed system to add, in a test page, some useful information for a user such as client identification information, test print request source, and a print server name, etc. Applicant respectfully disagrees. Column 3, lines 50-67 merely discusses, among other things, that the server stores data structures used for the operation of the client processor/printer network, such as a printer driver table which contains a listing that associates each printer connected to the server with a printer driver procedure for the printer; Column 4, lines 35-67 merely discusses that the server accumulates data regarding the printers including the name of the service, the type of the service and the address of the available service (e.g., print actions); and, as discussed above, column 5, lines 52-53 merely discusses that "printing test page" is one type of status regarding a printer that can be displayed at the client processor. Nothing in those passages even hint of the server preparing in advance identification information of the plurality of client apparatuses such that the identification information is included in test print information, and then transmits the test print information to the plurality of client apparatuses. Thus Applicant has found nothing in Gase that would teach or suggest "transmission controlling means for controlling operations to transmit, without waiting for a request from any of the client apparatuses, to each of the plurality of client apparatuses determined by said determining means, a set-up instruction to set up a driver for that client apparatus and a test printing instruction to have the client apparatus execute test printing to check if the driver set-up for the client apparatus has been completed, via the network, wherein the test printing is executed after the driver set up is executed at the client apparatus, and wherein identification information of the plurality of client apparatuses is printed in the test printing at a

9

<u>printer corresponding to the set up driver</u>," as recited in Claim 55 (emphasis added).

Accordingly, Applicant submits that Claim 55 is patentable over Henry and Gase, whether considered separately or in any permissible combination (if any).

A review of the other art of record has failed to reveal anything which, in Applicant's opinion, would remedy the deficiencies of the art discussed above, as a reference against Claim 55.

Independent Claims 60 and 65 are method and computer program product claims, respectively, corresponding to apparatus Claim 55, and are believed to be patentable for at least the same reasons as discussed above in connection with Claim 55.

The other claims in this application are each dependent from one or another of the independent claims discussed above and are therefore believed patentable for the same reasons. Since each dependent claim is also deemed to define an additional aspect of the invention, however, the individual reconsideration of the patentability of each on its own merits is respectfully requested.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicant respectfully requests favorable reconsideration and early passage to issue of the present application.

Applicant's undersigned attorney may be reached in our New York office by telephone at (212) 218-2100. All correspondence should continue to be directed to our below listed address.

Respectfully submitted,

/Jennifer A. Reda/
Jennifer A. Reda
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No.: 57,840

FITZPATRICK, CELLA, HARPER & SCINTO
30 Rockefeller Plaza
New York, New York 10112-3801
Facsimile: (212) 218-2200

FCHS_WS 1945410v1